

**REMARKS:**

Applicants acknowledge with appreciation that the Examiner withdrew the previous rejection of independent claims 1 and 7 in the above-captioned patent application. Claims 1-7 currently are pending and are subject to examination in the above-captioned patent application. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the above-captioned patent application in view of the following remarks.

In the Office Action mailed August 8, 2005, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,060,272 to Suzuki. The Examiner also rejected claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as allegedly being rendered obvious by Suzuki in view of Patent Cooperation Treaty Publication No. WO 93/03549 to Silfvast et al. ("Silfvast"). Moreover, the Examiner rejected claims 4 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as allegedly being rendered obvious by Suzuki in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,438,241 to Silfvast et al. ("Silfvast '241"). In addition, the Examiner rejected claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as allegedly being rendered obvious by Suzuki. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections, as follows.

Applicants independent claim 1 recites an audio signal processing apparatus, comprising "operating means for setting parameters in order for said signal processing means to process the audio signals; storing means for storing a **series** of past operation data containing past operation information of the operating means, said past operation information being associated with a **series** of movements of said operating means; [and] designating means capable of automatically effecting a desired treatment in accordance with the past operation data stored in the storing means." Similarly, Applicants' independent claim 7 describes an audio signal processing apparatus,

comprising “a memory device which stores a **series** of past operation data containing past operation information of the operating device, the past operation information being associated with a **series** of movements of the operating device; and a controller which sets parameters in order for the signal processor to process the audio signals in accordance with the desired treatment when the designating device is operated.” Thus, in Applicants’ independent claims 1 and 7, the “**series** of past operation data” includes past operation information “associated with a **series** of movements of the operating means.”

For example, Applicants’ specification describes an embodiment of the present invention in which “when the memory button 16 is first pushed ON and then pushed OFF, an angular velocity and a rotating direction of the JOG dial 21 rotated during a time period from said ON to said OFF may be stored in a past operation recording memory within the storing section A4.” Appl’n, Page 21, Lines 8-13. Subsequently, “when the PLAY button 17 is pushed ON, the past data of the angular velocity and the rotating direction of the JOG dial 21 stored in the past operation recording memory are read-out successively, so as to calculate an accumulated rotating amount of the JOG dial 21 in accordance with a rotating direction thereof.” Id. at Page 22, Lines 3-9.

In contrast to Applicants’ claimed invention as set forth in independent claims 1 and 7, Suzuki merely describes a memory 30 that stores the **last** operation position information of each fader operation, i.e., **only data associated with one time point is stored in memory 30**. See, e.g., Suzuki, Column 4, Lines 1-10 and 45-47. As such, Suzuki clearly fails to disclose or suggest a memory for storing a **series** of past operation data containing past operation information of an operating device, as set forth


in Applicants' independent claims 1 and 7. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of independent claims 1 and 7 at least for this reason.

Moreover, Applicants respectfully note that in response to an Office Action mailed February 26, 2003, in the above-captioned patent application, Applicants made arguments with respect to Suzuki that are similar or are substantially the same as the arguments that are included in Applicants' response to the present Office Action, and the Examiner withdrew the rejection of independent claims 1 and 7 in view of Suzuki based on Applicants' arguments.

Claims 2-6 depend from allowable, independent claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 2-6 at least for this reason.

**CONCLUSION:**

Applicants respectfully submit that the above-captioned patent application is in condition for allowance, and such action is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that an in-person or telephonic interview with Applicants' representatives would expedite the prosecution of the above-captioned patent application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney of records. Applicants believe that no fees are due as a result of this response. Nevertheless, in the event of any variance between the fees determined by Applicants and those determined by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, please charge or credit any such variance to the undersigned's Deposit Account No. 01-2300, referencing Attorney Docket No. 107156-09039.

Respectfully submitted,  
  
Timothy J. Chuma  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 48,340

**Customer No. 004372**  
ARENT FOX, PLLC  
1050 Connecticut Ave., N.W., Suite 400  
Washington, D.C. 20036-5339  
Telephone No. (202) 715-8434  
Facsimile No. (202) 638-4810

GEO/TJC:ksm